

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 635

95

SP 011 403

AUTHOR Cooke, Kathleen G.; Whittle, Jenifer
TITLE Factors Affecting the Institutional Development of
CBTE Programs. Vol. I. A Descriptive and Summary
Report of the Research.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Teacher Education
Developmental Service.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher
Corps.
PUB DATE 76
CONTRACT 300-76-0034
NOTE 125p.; For related documents, see SP011 401-409 and
SP011 542
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Background; Development; *Educational Research;
*Performance Based Teacher Education; Research;
*Research Design; *Research Methodology; *Research
Utilization; State Surveys; *Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

This document is a synthesis and summary of five reports investigating the experience of New York State in the implementation of competency based teacher education. The document presents: (1) background information that determined the basis for the study; (2) description of project development procedures; (3) intervening variables encountered as the research progressed; (4) impressions of researchers regarding the feelings of respondents toward items not discussed in the questionnaire; (5) short summaries of each of the five reports included in the series; (6) a synthesis of major findings of the study; and (7) recommendations for policy making and program design processes. Appendices present (1) a glossary of terms, (2) the questionnaire, (3) data on responses, (4) financing of CBTE teacher development programs, (5) summaries of three related studies of competency based teacher education implementation, (6) extended summaries of each of the studies included in the research, and (7) a model for cooperative research. (MJB)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED143635

Factors Affecting The Institutional Development of CBTE Programs / vol.1

A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Kathleen G. Cooke
Jenifer Whittle

Teacher Education Developmental Service / John Ether, Director

Spring 1976

State University of New York at Albany

BEST COPY
AVAILABLE

SP011 403

Preface

In July 1970, Teacher Corps requested all 5th cycle programs to begin developing Competence-Based Teacher Education programs. In July 1971, Teacher Corps required that all programs funded be competence-based. Since that time, Teacher Corps has been a major force in the development, demonstration and implementation of CBTE.

In 1972, the New York State Board of Regents set, as a goal, the establishment of teacher certification that ensures possession and maintenance of demonstrated competence on the part of teachers. The movement to CBTE in New York State should be completed by 1980.

These two facts come together quite naturally.

"What can be learned from the experiences in New York State as the transition is made? What help can be provided educational leaders in all other parts of the nation as a result of the New York State Experience?"

We at the State University of New York at Albany were given the opportunity to attempt a response to those questions. An inter-disciplinary group of faculty and advanced graduate students in the School of Education accepted that responsibility. This volume is one of a group written as a result of that acceptance.

The various volumes reflect the dimensions of the investigation.

A series of six volumes with the overall title of Factors Affecting the Institutional Development of CBTE Programs, gathered extensive information from the various teacher training institutions concerning the intra-institutional approach to the state mandate. The sub-titles of the volumes indicate the wide range of concerns investigated and reported. These sub-titles are: Descriptive and Summary Report, Process Environment Factors, Organizational Change Factors, Decision Making Factors, Leadership Factors and Technical Assistance Factors.

The current volume, Descriptive and Summary Report, synthesizes the data and recommendations of the five reports resulting from the study: Factors Affecting the Institutional Development of CBTE Programs. Based on this data, and the general characteristics of programs receiving one and four year program registration, policy recommendations are made.

SP 011 403

Another volume, "Factors Affecting CBTE Program Development as reported by Institutions and the New York State Education Department" reports data relating to institutional perception of problems related to program development. Institution of higher education and State Education Department perceptions are reported and compared. An additional dimension of this report is an analysis of the State Education Department's proposal review process.

The research group felt that an important population was not being reported. Four teacher training institutions, each with a long history of teacher preparation, did not file a revised program with the State Education Department. What was to be learned from these? An in-depth case study was done of one of these institutions. "A Case Study in CBTE Program Development from the Perspective of Inter and Intra Organizational Conflict" is a report of those data.

The final question the research group addressed reflected a concern for that group of people seeking teacher certification but who were not affiliated with a registered program. Who are they? What preparation do they have? Data responding to these and other such questions is reported in "A Descriptive Profile of Individuals Applying for Certification Through Individual Review Procedures".

Directing and coordinating this effort has been one of the most exciting experiences of my professional life. Acknowledgments are too extensive to attempt. Suffice it to say that cooperation of faculty, students, people from so many campuses in the State, our support staff, etc., was truly phenomenal.

One exception must be made. Without the herculean efforts and high level talent of Ms. Kathy Cooke and Ms. Jenifer Whittle, this work would still be in formative stages.

It is our hope that we have, indeed, provided information to help educational leaders throughout the nation to judiciously consider CBTE and, if appropriate, to successfully implement that system.

John A. Ether
Professor of Education
Project Director

A DESCRIPTIVE AND SUMMARY REPORT OF THE
RESEARCH

Table of Contents

SECTION I	<u>Page</u>
Background Information.....	1
Project Development.....	4
Intervening Variables.....	13
SECTION II	
Impressions.....	16
Summaries of the Five Reports.....	24
Synthesis.....	37
Recommendations.....	50
APPENDIX A	
Glossary of Terms	
APPENDIX B	
Questionnaire	
APPENDIX C	
Responding Institutions	
Number Responses by Category	
Demographic Data	
APPENDIX D	
Financial Data	
APPENDIX E	
Characteristics of Programs by Registration	
APPENDIX F	
Summary of Related Studies	
APPENDIX G	
Model for Cooperative Research	

This document consists of material prepared under Contract
No. 300-76-0034, National Teacher Corps

SECTION I

... Background Information

... Project Development

... Intervening Variables

This section will first provide some necessary background information which formed the basis for the study. Next a description of the development of the project will be given including such things as who was involved, group procedures, etc. Also included in this section is a discussion of some intervening variables which were encountered as the research progressed.

History of CBTE in New York State

During the past forty years much change has taken place in the regulation of teacher preparation and certification practices in New York State. Mandatory requirement of a baccalaureate degree for most public school teachers was established in 1936. In 1943, the fifth year requirement was enacted for secondary and special certificates; in 1963 this was extended to elementary certificates. Certification has been granted by the State to students successfully completing an accredited academic program.

Recently the 1972 New York Board of Regents published "Education Beyond High School; the Regents Tentative State-wide Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education". That document cited changes in the economic, cultural and educational sectors of society that necessitated a re-evaluation of teacher preparation programs. The Regents goal for the preparation and practice of professional personnel in the school is:

To establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the school possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn.

The Regents intended this goal to be implemented in Competency Based Teacher Education programs, with the state maintaining ultimate control through its program registration system.

Groundwork toward a competency-based teacher preparation program was laid in 1971 when 12 field-based trial projects dealing with program revision were sanctioned and supported by the New York State Department of Education. The projects

included faculty and staff from public schools and colleges and teachers in training who identified school goals, relevant teacher competencies, evidence that such competencies are influential, and training programs to develop those competencies. These trial projects were continued and became models for the institutions now involved in re-writing teacher education programs in a competency-based mode. Other models, including the various Teacher Corps programs, were being developed and tested during the same period.

To implement the goal of state-wide competency based teacher education, a series of regional meetings were held in 1973, outlining new procedures and standards for state certification. A time line for program registration was established, beginning in 1976 for certain elementary certifications, concluding in 1980 with a competency based program for school administrators.

The first round of program submissions was completed in February, 1975. This research report concerns those institutions involved in meeting the February, 1975 deadline.

Statement of The Problem

What are the processes involved in institutions of higher education and their consortia as they respond to a New York State mandate for CBTE?

The February, 1975 deadline for programs in elementary education, special education of the deaf and blind, and speech-hearing education marked the first mandate change

toward Competency-Based Teacher Training in New York State. One hundred and forty-three teacher training programs in sixty institutions were required to respond to this deadline by submitting teacher training programs for program registration to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification. Due to the wide variety of institutional settings and characteristics represented by this group of teacher training institutions, responses to the state mandate took varying forms. Despite these differences in institutional settings and characteristics, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification was confronted with the problem of applying and developing standardized criteria upon which to base decisions regarding program registration. It is from these two phenomena; 1) the variations in institutional setting and characteristics, and; 2) the Division's state-wide mandate and standardized criteria for program development and registration, that the problem which this study addresses emanates.

This study concerns itself with the first part of the problem: the process of developing CBTE programs in sixty institutions in New York State with varying institutional settings and differing organizational, social, and physical characteristics.

Research Developers

In August of 1975 TEDS invited several faculty members of the School of Education, SUNY Albany, to read the '75-'76 proposal and consider participating in the research project described therein. An introductory meeting was held at which time the scope and focus of the study were described, and procedural questions were dealt with. Those professors who decided to participate were encouraged to select one advanced graduate student each to work with them.

The group consisted of Drs. Alexina Baldwin and Dennis Nielsen, Department of Curriculum and Instruction; Dr. Charles Hancock, Department of Instruction; Drs. Nicholas DeLuca and Nancy Howes, faculty, Mr. David Rostetter, student, Department of Educational Administration; Dr. Joseph Scimecca, faculty, Ms. Jenifer Whittle and Ms. Jill Bystydzienski, students, Department of Foundations of Education; and Mr. Mohammed Yaghi, Department of Public Affairs; Dr. John Ether, project director was assisted by Ms. Kathleen Cooke.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to: 1) identify, 2) describe, and 3) compare the characteristics (elements or factors) of the process of designing CBTE program proposals in various institutions in New York State as they responded to a state-wide mandate for CBTE. Attention centered on the responses of institutions to the following concerns:

1. The type of support system which develops within an institution to effect a change in the teacher training program; emphasis should be on those elements which seem to be common among institutions.
2. The kinds of technical assistance that seem useful in order to effect an institutional change.
3. The types of external relationships that develop in order to effect institutional change.
4. A documentation of the success and failures that institutions have faced.
5. The extent to which an institution defines its problems and seeks assistance in the solution of these problems.
6. The types of assistance that an institution finds useful in the course of changing its methods of preparing teachers.

The fourth concern (a documentation of the success and failures that institutions have faced) was developed by one researcher into two studies. A Case Study in CBTE Program Development: from the Perspective of Inter and Intra Organizational Conflict investigates one institution of higher education that did not submit a program to the State Education Department. Factors Affecting CBTE Program Development as reported by Institutions and the New York State Education Department identifies areas of concern in rewriting teacher education programs as perceived by institutions of higher education and the State Education Department.

The remaining concerns (1,2,3,5,6) were expanded and clarified in an attempt to establish the parameters of a collaborative study.

The fact that CBTE is a largely unexplored topic led to a concern on the part of the participants to examine as much information with regard to responses to the mandate as possible. Thus it was anticipated that this project would uncover much that could be further investigated.

Focus

The study focused upon those institutions which:

- 1.) were to submit teacher training program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. These include programs for the preparation of teachers in the following subject areas:
 - a. N-6
 - b. Special Education
 - c. 7-9
 - d. Speech-Hearing
 - e. Deaf
 - f. Blind
- 2) received one-year and/or four-year registration of their program proposals from the State Education Dept., Div. of Teacher Education and Certification,
- 3) met the criteria set by the researchers regarding institutions, and whether or not they were public or private institutions containing appropriate programs, and,
- 4) indicated a willingness to participate in the study by allowing administration of questionnaires. It should be noted that the state mandate places responsibility for program design upon the institutions of higher education. However, the mandate also requires that the institutions design the programs by collaborating with school district personnel and personnel from appropriate professional agencies. This collaborative group is known as the consortium and becomes the focal point for data collection in the study. The consortium also included sub groupings termed the Policy Board and Task Force whose behavior and involvement in the process will be analyzed.

Population

The population for this study consisted of those institutions which were required to submit CBTE program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. Sixty institutions fell into this category encompassing one hundred forty-six teacher training programs. These programs proposed to train elementary school teachers in the following areas:

1.	N-6	(81)
2.	Speech Hearing	(25)
3.	7-9	(6)
4.	Deaf	(3)
5.	Blind	(1)
6.	Special Education	(30)
		<u>146</u>

Sample

The researchers assumed that factors of institutional size and whether or not institutions were publicly or privately funded could provide a basis for comparison. Also, two categories were formed on the basis of whether or not institutions received one year or four year registration from the SED. Comparisons are made on the basis of these categories of analysis in each report. The categories formed on the basis of these criteria (size, funding, and registration) follow:

One year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
small	4

Four year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
small	4

There was an insufficient number of small institutions to categorize them into private or public categories. One category had only four institutions and therefore the decision was made to place four institutions in each category to provide for a balanced response from all categories. Initially, institutions to be placed in the remaining categories were chosen to insure the widest possible geographical dispersion throughout the state. Some institutions declined participation in the study. Back-up institutions were also selected on the basis of geographical dispersion and availability.

An additional category of institutions was constructed from institutions which submitted two programs which received differing program registration (1 year or 4 year). This was done to provide a comparison of one and four year program development within institutions. This category was divided into public and private institutions.

One and four year registration

Public	(4)
Private	(4)

As a result of these categories and the necessity to place four institutions in each category, thirty two institutions comprised the sample.

Eighteen of the 32 institutions responded.

Eight individuals at each institution were identified according to role. These roles were identified in order to

allow for a representative sample of all groups involved in the development of the CBTE program. The individuals identified were as follows:

- School of Education Dean or Department Chairman
- Public School Principal on the Policy Board
- Public School Teacher on the Policy Board
- College Faculty Member on the Policy Board
- Task Force Chairman
- Task Force Member from public school
- Task Force Member from college faculty
- Chairman of Policy Board

Procedures of the Research Project

As was discussed earlier in this Volume, the researchers who participated in this project were from several different Departments in the School of Education at SUNY Albany (Foundations of Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Administration and Instruction). The procedure used to design and carry out the project reflected this both theoretically and practically.

During the early phases of project design, the researchers met as a group to establish the parameters of the study and define the relevant terms. Although each participant was free to develop areas of interest, some consensus was needed as to the general scope of the whole project, the responsibilities of the individual researchers, and the division of labor during the design process.

Thus, while the researchers came to a general agreement on all major points, there was a need for compromise and flexibility in planning the data collection. Much of the

information needed was quite straightforward, e.g., technical and financial assistance, and therefore was felt to be well suited to the questionnaire method. Other kinds of interests were of a more subjective nature requiring additional probing and would vary among institutional settings, therefore it was first assumed that the interview method would be a better choice for collecting this kind of data. After further consideration, however, given time, financial, and manpower constraints, it was decided that all of the information could be obtained through questionnaire.

At this point subgroups based on interest were formed to complete the design of the various sections of the questionnaire. When the various sections were completed, they were distributed to all other members who made criticisms and suggestions. Thus, through the internal workings of the group, the construct validity of the entire questionnaire was dealt with. Once the questionnaire was completed, a pilot study was conducted. The responses were reviewed and appropriate changes made.

Whenever it could be arranged with the participating institution, it was decided that on-site visitations would be conducted. During these visitations, information was given about the total research project, any problems with the answering of the questionnaire were dealt with, and presumably a higher response rate was gained through personal contact. Also during the on-site visitations, information about Teacher Education Developmental Services and the library holdings were distributed.

When questionnaires were left to be completed, a contact person was set up within the institution. After the initial on-site visitations, follow-up letters were sent to this person and also in some circumstances, those making the initial visits telephoned to learn the status of the questionnaire collection.

Given the interest areas of the groups and the type of data returned from the various sections of the questionnaire, different procedures of data analysis had to be employed. Some responses generated easily quantifiable data whereas open-ended questions required individual reading and coding.

The subgroups met at their convenience to plan and carry out data analysis and to write the final subgroup report. There was less need for compromise during this process because it was agreed that each subgroup would be solely responsible for its own report. All the researchers, however, responded to these individual reports, ideas were reworded when necessary, and the final documents from the groups were then written. Six reports resulted from the collaborative study.

1. "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs: A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research."
2. "Process Environment Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
3. "Organizational Change Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."

4. "Decision Making Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs.
5. "Leadership Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
6. "Technical Assistance Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."

Toward the end of the project the researchers met as a group to discuss results of each report and to identify trends and common characteristics. Again the varied backgrounds of the participants surfaced, as evidenced by the conclusions drawn.

It was clear throughout the project that the areas of professional interest and expertise of the researchers guided their thinking about both exploratory research methods and the types of conclusions which may be validly drawn from them. It is generally agreed, however, that the discussions and resulting decisions and/or compromises emanating from the differing perspectives of the researchers strengthened rather than weakened this project.

During '75-'76, TEDS also funded another research project, "A Descriptive Profile of Individuals Applying for Certification through Individual Review Procedures". This study sought to identify the characteristics of persons seeking teaching or administrative certificates in order to provide data for policy implications for the improvement of the individual review process.

Intervening Variables

There were several factors encountered in the field which shaped the progress of this research project. Since it was of an exploratory nature, the participants expected to encounter variables which are difficult to control and therefore tried to adjust for these things as quickly as possible.

One of the most difficult variables to control was response rate. As was described earlier, being a largely untapped area, the researchers sought to look at as much information about the program change process as possible. This necessitated a great many items on the questionnaire. Thus, the size and format of the research questionnaire (see Appendix C) turned out to be a hindrance to data collection. Since the study was conceived of as a descriptive one, the researchers wanted as much data as possible. Similar questions in several sections were seen as validity checks. Items were included to cover a wide range of possible situations. For all these reasons, the questionnaire was a document of approximately 40 pages. Although not every item was pertinent to any one respondent, the document was cumbersome in appearance. It is assumed that many initial respondents simply never finished completing it due to flagging interest and the press of other responsibilities. It should probably be recommended that more careful editing of items, and better selection of respondents for particular items would yield a smaller but not less effective document.

Corollary to this is the decision to rely on only the questionnaire for data collection rather than in combination with interviewing. Through an interview, some of the procedural and technical questions could have been thoroughly pursued, and therefore eliminated from the questionnaire. Also, the interview technique might have allowed for concerns of a particular consortium to be brought out which were not touched upon in the questionnaire. (Although respondents were directed to expand upon items or give additional information where needed, few did so.)

The membership of the group questioned also indirectly affected the response rate. The consortium approach required members to be drawn from the faculty and administration of universities and public schools. The fact that the consortium participants had just completed the long task of program development with no relief from other professional duties caused many possible respondents to decline participation. Also related to membership, an attempt had to be made to accommodate the varying schedules of the participants which often resulted in the necessity of the respondents to complete the questionnaire at a later time. In some instances what happened then was that the contact person at the IHE arranged for the questionnaires to be presented, but could not guarantee the response of any particular member of that consortium.

Another factor which affected the response rate was that the roles played by the respondents in each institution

varied and at times overlapped. What this means is that differences occurred among institutions in number of roles and who played them. (See Appendix C)

The organizational climate prevalent in the consortium was a factor which influenced the individual response rate as well as whether a particular institution chose to participate or not. The State Education Department had required parity and sign-off from all three consortium constituencies (IHE, teachers' representatives and public school administrators). In some instances, the working relationship among those three was quite fragile, and spokespersons for the IHE were reluctant to do anything to upset that balance. Therefore, it might have been felt that to call a meeting for the purpose of participating in this research might have only added to the already tenuous relationships.

Since consortium participation was an added duty for those who worked at rewriting the teacher education programs, time and money were real factors for those considering participating in this project. Travel time and costs and arrangements for substitutes to handle regular duties were sometimes not available, since no extra funds were allocated for this CBTE activity.

Although there existed these intervening variables, which acted to complicate the data gathering process, adjustments were made whenever possible to aid respondents in completing the questionnaires.

SECTION II

... Impressions

... Summary of the Five Reports

... Synthesis

... Recommendations

This section will further detail the research project by first presenting a discussion based on the impressions of the researchers. While the questionnaire provided the main source of data, the researchers also had an opportunity to talk with the respondents and to form some impressions about the process of change to CBTE. Therefore this documentation of impressions is included as further background of the total change process and also perhaps to suggest areas for further study.

Next in this section is a short summary of each of the five reports (Process Environment, Technical Assistance, Decision Making Process, Leadership Process, and Organizational Change Process), followed by a synthesis of the major points of the study and recommendations for policy making and program design process.

Impressions

Although a questionnaire was used to aid in identifying factors affecting the institutional development of competency based teacher education programs, it became clear during informal discussion with respondents at participating institutions that there were several factors operating which were not dealt with in the questionnaire. At regular project meetings the researchers discussed recent on site visits. Certain feelings and impressions expressed by respondents seemed common to many institutions of higher education (IHE). Since these factors affected the program development process, a discussion of them will be included in this report. Information in this section is based on periodic discussions held after on site visits reflecting the written and oral comments of respondents and a lengthy discussion of all researchers at the end of the project for the purpose of identifying the issues to be dealt with here.

There seemed to be little, if any, opposition to the concept of competency based teacher education, per se. The philosophical issues were generally not discussed. Instead, the identification of teacher competencies and a means of assessing them was the main focus of concern in writing a program. Especially in those institutions currently operating in what was defined as a CBTE framework, the comments were favorable about this method of teacher preparation. There was, however, some discomfort about CBTE being mandated as the only methodo-

logical base upon which to build a teacher education program. Questions and comments stemmed from a lack of knowledge regarding why only one approach was to be considered, and why CBTE was to be that approach. While the New York State Education Department published several documents ("New Style of Certification", address by William Boyd, "Regents Plan for Development of Post Secondary Education") which dealt with the issue of CBTE, there was no single statement that presented a rationale for accepting CBTE as the sole method of teacher preparation and outlined an implementation scheme. This lack of definitional reference was a source of confusion to IHEs as they prepared their program.

There was a range of attitudes expressed by the consortium members about the task of revising their teacher education programs. Contributing factors to these attitudes may be the degree to which a college depends upon its teacher education program for student enrollment and the amount of control the institution of higher education feels is exerted by the New York State Education Department. These elements were not isolated by the questionnaire, and yet might be useful in assessing differences between programs receiving one or four year program registration.

If the colleges and universities felt there was a lack of guidelines in writing their programs, they were also concerned that they knew little or nothing about the criteria of assessment that would be applied to their programs. The State Education

Department did not reveal the standards it would apply in assigning a one year or four year registration before the programs were submitted, nor did the IHEs feel they were given adequate explanation of why their programs were registered as they were.

In general there was a pervasive uncertainty about the entire process of change to competency based teacher education. Those responding to the mandate were not certain what was expected, what sources of information were available, etc., and also were not certain about the State Education Department's part in the whole process. Was there a "right way" to define the competencies of a good teacher, i.e. a model held by the State Education Department, or was the definition really at the discretion of each institution? Thus, the goal was given but not the process to get there.

Likewise, many felt uncertain about the implications arising from the programs they were planning. Since not all colleges and universities were previously considering a CBTE mode of teacher preparation, several felt the need for investigating and building a rationale for changing, for clearly understanding the philosophical base upon which CBTE and their current program were built, and for considering long range implications as much as possible. The time constraints set up by program registration deadlines did not allow these questions to be answered before continuing with program development.

In an attempt to settle confounding issues, various sources of assistance were sought. In some instances, outside consultants

were brought in to help in program development, external foundation grants were sought, and/or new people with a special expertise in CBTE were added to the staff. It was generally observed that institutions with individuals already on the staff who had knowledge of CBTE had an easier time in developing a program which received a four year program registration.

Many institutions consulted the New York State Education Department directly. In some cases respondents reported that information from that Department was unclear or contradictory. At many sites, researchers from this project were questioned about their knowledge of the program review process and the criteria that were applied, in hopes of gaining information regarding an IHE's document. Most participants eagerly shared their programs with the researchers, and requested information from them about what was available from other colleges and universities in the same process.

It seems that two types of communication channels could have been reinforced: those between the New York State Education Department and individual institutions, and those among institutions preparing for the same program deadline. While the State Education Department provided a set of guidelines for program preparation, it did not furnish colleges and universities with the criteria that would be applied in assessing programs. Despite statements to the contrary by the State Education Department, IHEs felt that there was a preferred program format which they were not being told about.

Even an informal communications network seemed lacking among the participants in this study for the purpose of sharing information helpful to CBTE program development. Since almost every responding institution was willing to share materials with the office directing this study (Teacher Education Developmental Service) and was eager to receive pertinent information, it can be assumed that the institutions of higher education would have shared with each other had the opportunity arisen.

A sentiment shared by many at participating institutions was a need for greater feedback from the State Education Department regarding the conferring of a one or four year program registration. Consortium and task force members were uncertain why their programs were registered as they were, and felt this lack of understanding to be a hindrance in either rewriting one year programs or writing secondary programs.

There seemed to be a feeling on the part of the public colleges and universities that it was easier for private schools to receive four year program registrations. This may have been precipitated because the public institutions had another bureaucratic layer to contend with. They were required to submit program proposals to State University of New York central administration for review prior to the review of the State Education Department.

Another consideration in writing the proposals which was mentioned by respondents from several institutions was that of time. The Technical Assistance report suggests that institutions well into the development of a CBTE program were not as affected

by the registration deadlines as were those who had more developmental work to do. Thus, most participants whose programs received one year registration commented that the amount of time allowed was insufficient to research and prepare an adequate program.

Corollary to this point is the fact that most college and university participants involved in the program development were not relieved of other responsibilities. Therefore, the work done on the competency based teacher education program was generally added to regular work requirements and thus may have been a source of resentment or at least may sometimes have been dealt with only superficially. Several small institutions of higher education pointed out that since their faculties were small, the people involved in preparing the elementary teacher education program (1975 deadline) were the same ones who would also be writing the program for secondary teachers (1977 deadline). Even in making arrangements for the on site data collection, there was hesitation in making further time commitments for the members of the consortium than that already necessary for work on CBTE program development.

In general the consortium participants received no financial compensation although several institutions did find small amounts of funds in the current budget for consultants and similar expenses. Additionally, at least one school was successful in receiving a small award (less than \$1,000) from a national

foundation for this effort. For a more complete discussion of finances, see the financial summary section of this report. The issue of the cost involved in writing and implementing a new teacher education program was a significant one to several respondents. However, due to the mandated nature of the change, the institutions of higher education were governed by state deadlines in marshalling their resources.

Many respondents expressed skepticism that CBTE would continue to receive such whole hearted support from the New York State Education Department. Some felt that the considerable amount of time and effort expended was simply a response to a bureaucratic regulation, and that as a methodological base for teacher education, CBTE would soon lose its compelling appeal. Having such an attitude, many participants were resentful of the work put forth and of the disruptions caused by the mandate and its deadline. Also, given the lack of information held by the institutions as to why the CBTE mandate was established, many felt the decision was politically motivated rather than being a reflection of the carefully assessed needs of the teacher preparation system.

Even given all of these considerations and the wide range of attitudes and abilities of the consortia members, all but four of the colleges and universities involved in teacher certification in NYS submitted program proposals for CBTE. Some of the responding institutions which received a one-year program registration indicated that this would then allow them more time to adequately investigate the philosophical

and educational implications of the change before further program development and implementation occurred.

Summary: "The Process Environment"

The Process Environment report dealt with an exploration into certain factors and how they affected responses by selected educational institutions to the CBTE mandate. While the possible factors were many, those focused upon as most relevant for this study were: (1) communications networks established, (2) the morale of individual members of consortia, and (3) the role of teachers' unions and their degree of cooperation and their relationship to four year program registration.

In studying the communications networks, the research focused upon three aspects: (1) formal vs informal, (2) availability of information, and (3) centralized vs decentralized networks. Although this report emphasizes caution in inferring too much from the data, it did appear that formal communications networks helped somewhat in receiving a four year program registration. The high availability of information concerning CBTE was found to be also related to four year registration. However, the data seemed to indicate that there was no relationship between the degree of centralization of communication and whether a four year or one year program registration was received.

The relationship of morale and compliance with the mandate was looked at in terms of five areas related to satisfaction felt by members of the consortium. The data were inconclusive in regard to this research question. Another area

related to morale, but not synonymous with it, was the initial resistance of individuals to the CBTE mandate. While the data are, once again, inconclusive, low resistance correlates negatively with four year program registration.

In regard to the role of the local teacher unions, the data seem to support a relationship between cooperation of local teacher unions and four year program registration.

Some more general findings, as background for further research, were also included in this report. In summary, they are as follows:

1. The major objectives of the CBTE groups participating in this study were reported to be: 1) assisting the university (in the case of each CBTE group) to develop and implement a CBTE program; 2) meeting the New York State Education Department mandate; and, 3) obtaining registration for the given program.
2. CBTE group members were involved to a degree which they collectively found satisfactory in establishing requisite group objectives.
3. Implementation of proposals is a key area of concern among respondents in this survey. Given the fact of mutually acceptable goals, excellent rapport among the various constituencies, and ultimate acceptance of a CBTE mode of instruction, the constraints of the local situation were found to be frequently mentioned as problems in implementing CBTE programs.

The major conclusions of the process environment report were:

1. the more information available, the greater the likelihood of four year registration.
2. the greater the cooperation of local teachers unions, the greater the likelihood of four year registration.

While data concerning other areas appeared inconclusive, those areas are still considered to be important and in connection with the above findings are offered as suggested topics for further study.

Summary: "The Technical Assistance"

The Technical Assistance report sought to identify, describe, and compare the characteristics of technical assistance as they relate to the process of meeting the New York State CBTE mandate.

The research questions dealt with the following issues:

1. What was the knowledge of participants regarding CBTE before and after working on the document
2. What was the difference in knowledge between those whose program received one year registration as opposed to those whose program was registered for four years
3. How types of technical assistance were rated for usefulness by respondents from public, private, large, small and one year, four year program registrations.

Fifteen institutions and 73 CBTE program development participants provided usable data for this report.

In attempting to relate four and/or one year program registration to the change in knowledge levels of participants, and the usefulness of seven types of assistance (consultants, internal and external training, conferences, general and skill training materials and other types) to knowledge of the concept of CBTE, knowledge of the New York State mandate and knowledge of program preparation, the researchers found that certain trends emerged.

Although schools receiving one year program registration indicated less knowledge of the CBTE concept at the outset, they also reported knowing more about it by the end of program development than did participants from schools receiving four year registration. It is suggested that knowledge of CBTE upon completion of the document is not highly related to preparing a program with four year registration. However, level of knowledge before re-writing is related to program registration.

In general, there was very little difference in the usefulness of technical assistance between large and small institutions. Institutions which received one year program registration rated the usefulness of technical assistance for each of the three elements of CBTE higher than did institutions receiving four year program registration. Internal training was the most useful type of technical assistance employed by institutions, regardless of program registration. Institutions receiving four year registration rated more types of assistance as "less than useful" than did institutions receiving one year program registration.

The Technical Assistance report concluded that institutions whose program was registered for one year spent more time and gathered more diverse information in seeking to prepare themselves to meet the state's requirements. However, in doing so, they seemingly spread their resources widely, and dispersed the focus of the project. A comparison of the final

products from all institutions might reveal important differences arising from the method of preparing to revise a teacher education program.

Summary: "Leadership"

Leadership is assumed to be crucial to the success of any innovation. To assess the effect on program registration of the leadership in colleges and universities in New York State as they prepared to meet the mandate for teacher education program change, the following research questions were developed:

1. What is the nature of leadership within and across the task force, policy board, and IHE in terms of the:
 - a. Leader's commitment to CBTE;
 - b. Leader's commitment to the design of a CBTE plan;
 - c. Leader's provision of logistical support for individuals working on the design of a CBTE plan;
 - d. Leader's provision of psychological support for individuals working on the design of a CBTE plan; and
 - e. Leader's frequency of meetings with the group or its individual members?
2. What are the areas of similarity or dissimilarity in the leadership of the task force, policy board and IHE as viewed across the varied categories of IHE size and type, program registration, respondent group, and program type?
3. What is the relationship, if any, between the various elements of leadership?
4. What is the set of leadership variables which most strongly relates to CBTE program design being accepted for a four rather than a one year period?

Analysis of the data generated by these questions revealed much about the leadership process. In general, respondents reported their leaders to be committed to CBTE and to designing a plan for its implementation. Toward this end, the leaders were perceived as providing formal logistical support and informal, psychological support for the work groups and their members. Most personnel agreed that their leaders were concerned about their subordinates' views, spent adequate time with co-workers, provided necessary and adequate CBTE information, and provided adequate feedback about an individual or group's design performance. Although most groups (IHE, task force, policy board) were fairly consistent with each other in their perceptions of leadership, the IHE respondents' opinion were usually less positive about their leader's support and commitment than were the other groups.

Differences in leadership characteristics at the .05 level or higher did not exist across the two program registration categories. However, size and type of IHE were significant variables, as leaders in small, private institutions were seen as more committed to CBTE and the design of CBTE programs and more logistically and psychologically supportive of their group's design efforts.

A multiple regression analysis identified leader's logistical support, leader's commitment to CBTE and design efforts, leader's psychological support and amount of time leaders spent meeting with others as the elements of

leadership most significantly associated with obtaining four year program registration. Together, these variables accounted for 32 percent of the variance associated with obtaining four year, rather than one year program registration. In turn, this was more likely to occur in consortia which worked with small, private IHE's rather than large public IHE's.

This report concluded that leaders took an active role in the work of their groups, and that this role was important to the design of a CBTE program. These findings, consistent with other theories and studies which have analyzed the change agent role of leaders, lead to the conclusion that good leadership practices contributed significantly to a design effort which resulted in a four year program registration.

Summary: "Decision Making"

The focus of the Decision Making report was to identify, describe and compare the processes involved as institutions of higher education and their consortia responded to the New York State Education Department mandate for competency based teacher education programs.

The following questions guided the research:

1. Who was involved in making decisions about:
 - a. Policy board composition and meetings
 - b. Consortium operating procedures
 - c. CBTE plan content
 - d. Final plan sign off procedures and protocol
2. What was the nature of involvement of individuals in the decision process of the policy board, task groups and institution of higher education (IHE)?

3. What were the characteristics of the decision making process followed by the consortium in terms of:
 - a. individual participation in the process
 - b. individual influence on the process
 - c. decision making style of the consortium leader
 - d. degree of conflict involved in the decision process
 - e. amount of time involved in reaching decisions
 - f. pressure to conform to the majority decision
4. What was the structure of the decision making process followed by the consortium?

Sixty-six individuals from 18 institutions provided useable data for this report.

It was found that policy boards were generally called together by deans or education department chairpersons who also decided on the composition of the boards. Decisions about consortium operating procedures, CBTE plan content, and the final plan for sign-off procedures and protocol were most often made by the consortium itself. The policy board steering committee was cited as next most important in this regard.

With respect to individual involvement, a majority of respondents indicated participation in terms of exchanging information as well as developing, selecting, implementing, and evaluating solutions to problems. The majority also indicated that they participated as much as they wished and felt that they were influential in making decisions.

The leadership style of the consortium was generally democratic. On the whole, all respondents felt the decision making process was relatively conflict free. The participants also agreed that the consortium decision process was expeditious and that they were not pressured to conform to majority opinions.

The participants did discern a distinct decision-making process and structure through which problems were defined and identified before solutions were put forth. Also, all solutions were presented before evaluation and appropriate information sources were identified. The participants felt that a feedback system existed within the consortium decision process and that decision rules existed to expedite the process of decision making.

This constitutes a general description of the decision making process. Significant differences based upon size and type of institution were also found. Small private institutions were more likely to receive four year program registrations than were large public institutions. Small private institutions typically dealt with fewer school districts, and the working relationships tended to be less structured and more informal than those of the larger institutions. A greater degree of conflict was evident in larger public institutions and they were less democratic in their decision making process.

The consortium type of organization for program development seemed to be a workable one. The majority of participants felt that the democratic, efficient nature of the decision making process, with an effective feedback system, allowed them to engage in participation to their satisfaction. On the whole, it appears that size was the crucial factor in the differences among institutions, since smaller IHE's with smaller consortia, tended to receive four year program registrations more frequently.

Summary: "Organizational Change"

The Organizational Change Process report investigated common change factors which were evident as teacher education institutions moved toward a CBTE model of teacher certification. This report addressed the following four questions:

1. What was the nature of the CBTE design process followed by those consortia in New York who worked to develop CBTE programs in 1975-1976?
2. What organizational change variables facilitated the design of a CBTE program?
3. Are all consortia equal in their ability to design a CBTE program without too much effort?
4. What variables can be used as strategic manipulable levers in the design of CBTE programs?

Policy Board, task force and institution of higher education respondents completed questionnaires which focused on the design phase of program development. The three similar questionnaires (each designed specifically for their target respondents) contained an average of 56 items, requiring the participants to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed (on a 1 to 5 Likert scale) with a change process statement. Altogether, 60 respondents from 18 institutions provided useable data for this report.

Most of the respondents in each group (policy board, task force and IHE) were positive about CBTE and their CBTE programs. They believed that CBTE and the CBTE programs they designed should provide sufficient teacher training information and should lead to more effective teacher preparation and performance.

Concerning the design process, respondents reported both positive and negative process characteristics. A majority

believed that communication and performance feedback networks within and across groups were used, design information was channeled through them and CBTE decision making about the design content and process was shared across the group. Respondents were generally negative about the degree to which they were logistically supported by their group leaders, but they were slightly positive about their psychological support. Specifically, however, the task force and policy board respondents were positive about the leadership roles their leaders assumed, but negative about the leadership role assumed by the IHE administrator. In addition, they believed that they were not given adequate advance preparation for working on the design of CBTE programs, a process they believed was difficult to undertake.

The formal organizational structure was reported to have both positive and negative characteristics. While a majority of respondents believed they had initiative, autonomy and accountability in working on the design process, a majority also felt that there were not many design rules or procedures, and few adequate rewards from their own organizations for their design efforts. These findings are different from those reported about the informal organizational environment in which most respondents felt positively. The respondents said they liked to work with their group, believed they could influence the CBTE policies and decisions being made, and believed that most of the groups and individuals involved in the consortia approved of CBTE.

Many variables were identified as important in the design of a CBTE program. Together, the organizational change variables accounted for more than 90 percent of the variance related to the design of a program which received four year registration. Of the 67 different variables studied in relation to the design of a CBTE program, 26 of them were found (through multiple regression analysis) to strongly relate to the design of a four year program. Overall, the largest predictors of four year program registration across all three respondent groups were: 1) the task force was given a useful inservice CBTE training program; 2) sufficient design funds or materials were provided to the design groups; 3) the individual designers and design groups approved of CBTE; 4) group communication and feedback channels were used to exchange CBTE design information and keep others informed of their activities; and 5) IHE administrators had freedom to control the CBTE design events.

It does not seem likely that all consortia are equal in their ability to design a CBTE program without much effort. There were many differences found across consortia and these differences likely affected the ease with which the CBTE program will ultimately be developed. It appears that consortia which worked with small and private IHEs rather than large and public IHEs were more likely to design a CBTE program which received four year registration. In this, the small and private IHEs were more likely to have a design process which : 1) used feedback network; 2) shared CBTE decision making; 3) provided designers with adequate logistical

and psychological support; 4) used communication networks; 5) kept design groups informed of each other's activities, and, 6) had CBTE approvals from IHE and school district administrators and school district teachers representatives.

The study's findings lead us to conclude that the CBTE program can be more easily designed if the IHE administrators and the consortia leaders work together to: 1) set up communication networks between the consortium design groups; 2) channel CBTE information exchange through the communication networks; 3) obtain some design funds and materials to support the consortium's efforts; 4) set up an inservice training program to assist the consortium designers in developing the program; and, 5) keep the policy board and task force groups informed of each others' design activities.

Synthesis

In order to summarize and synthesize the findings of the total study of the change in New York State to the competence based model of teacher certification, this section will focus on the following concerns from which the parts of the study were derived:

1. The type of support system which develops within an institution to effect a change in the teacher training program; emphasis should be on those elements which seem to be common among institutions.
2. The kinds of technical assistance that seem useful in order to effect an institutional change.
3. The types of external relationships that develop in order to effect institutional change.
4. The extent to which an institution defines its problems and seeks assistance in the solution of these problems.
5. The types of assistance that an institution finds useful in the course of changing its methods of preparing teachers.

Preliminary to this discussion, however, there is a need to present a description of the environment within which these concerns were dealt with by those involved. The New York State mandate for CBTE programs required institutions of higher education to work collaboratively with public school administrators and representatives of the local teachers. Specifically, the program submitted to the State Education Department was required to be agreed upon by all, as evidenced by signatures representing the three constituencies. While the extent of the collaboration was thus defined, the nature of the working

relationship was not. It is interesting to note, therefore, that all IHE's responding to this project reported a consortium approach to the process of planning for program change.

All consortia studied seemed to have a similar organizational structure which became more complex as the size of the IHE and the number of public school districts increased. In general, there was a Policy Board consisting of representatives from all three constituencies. This group served to oversee and coordinate the work of various task forces which also had tripartite representation. It was at the Task Force level that actual writing of programs took place.

In larger IHE's, the Policy Board may have coordinated the efforts of several Task Forces, each working on a different program proposal (elementary provisional or permanent certification, speech/hearing provisional or permanent certification, etc.). The smaller IHE's, in general, had fewer program proposals, and dealt with fewer public school districts. In these cases the Policy Board and Task Force were sometimes one and the same.

The respondents generally agreed that the consortium model was a workable one and reported being satisfied with their opportunities for input, and felt that all suggestions were considered fairly. In general, they indicated that all solutions were presented before a decision was made and that the decision making style is best characterized as democratic.

Democratic decision making was empirically related (shown in a multiple regression analysis) to receiving a four year program registration.

Given this brief description, each of the initial concerns will be dealt with within the consortium structure. The first of these concerns deals with the "type of support system which develops within an institution to effect a change in the teacher training program with emphasis on those elements which seem to be common among institutions." Although the term "support system" could be defined in numerous ways, the ideas investigated in the combined reports fall into two categories, i.e., psychological support and logistical support. Also, when dealing with support systems, the focus is on those within the organization. For example, the focus would not be on technical assistance as a support system but rather on the internal communications networks which hindered or facilitated its use.

Logistical support dealt with such common elements as communications networks, utilization and availability of information, utilization and availability of assistance, and feedback mechanisms within the design groups.

As has been explained previously, while not mandated, the consortium approach was the most typical way that the various constituencies met to write up the proposal for the change to CBTE and to eventually institute it upon approval.

As was indicated, the consortium approach seemed to be a workable one; a majority of the respondents indicated that no one alone was responsible for decisions as to content or process but was the work of all of the consortium members. Thus, through the consortium approach there was the potential for many people to be involved and often the main structure was differentiated into subunits to expedite the process. Therefore, in order to coordinate the final output, communications networks, one form of logistical support, were focused upon.

When respondents were asked about the necessity for communications networks, a majority agreed that, given the consortium design and division of labor, communications networks were needed. Not only were they necessary, but there was found to be a positive relationship between the existence of these networks and four year program registration. Those institutions which had highly established communication networks in the form of memos and scheduled meetings, i.e., highly formalized networks, were more likely to obtain a four year program registration.

Once the communications networks are established, it is important to determine to what degree information is channeled through the existing networks. The activity of developing the CBTE program proposal was new to most of the participants so there was a strong need to obtain as much information as possible. Also, as was indicated earlier, through the consortium approach there was a division of labor, so it was necessary not only to share information within but also

between design groups.

The respondents indicated that CBTE information was channeled through the networks and the main focus of activity was on information exchange. This is substantiated by the fact that when asked about the nature of participation in decision making, nearly all respondents listed "exchanging information" as the activity most often engaged in. The respondents did, however, indicate a lack of strong communications networks between members of the groups and the group leaders and the administrators. Also, a majority of the respondents felt that there was a problem in intergroup communications, i.e., the design groups were not kept informed of other design groups' activities.

Closely tied to the establishment and utilization of communications networks is the second form of logistical support, i.e., the availability and utilization of information. This was investigated through questions about sources of availability, engagement in discussion, and difficulty in obtaining available resources.

In terms of decision making, a majority of the respondents indicated that necessary information and appropriate information sources were clearly identified. The respondents indicated in a majority of cases that the leaders provided necessary information on CBTE, provided necessary CBTE design information,

and provided adequate CBTE design information. Also, in regard to leadership, information exchange was important in a positive relationship between certain variables and four year program registration. A multiple regression analysis showed that four year program registration was strongly related to leaders giving sufficient assistance to the work groups and providing information about CBTE.

Another source of logistical support relates to the availability and utilization of assistance. Approximately three-fourths of the respondents stated that the leaders provided sufficient and necessary assistance to the group. A majority also indicated that sufficient and necessary assistance was provided to individual group members by the leadership. When the members of the design groups were asked about assistance in the form of in-service training, a majority indicated that the task force did not receive useful in-service training. Only about one-half of the respondents indicated that they were given useful CBTE orientation to understand the program. Also, in terms of monetary assistance, all design groups indicated that they did not receive sufficient funds.

Another type of logistical support system which developed was the feedback network. As was stated, the design group participants most often had not previously worked on designing a CBTE program. Therefore, there was a strong need for feedback so that the designers knew how the work was progressing.

In terms of decision making, a majority of respondents indicated that a feedback system was built into the process and served to expedite and evaluate it. Also, a majority of respondents agreed that the leadership provided adequate feedback to group members. When the designers were kept appraised of their performance, this was related to receiving a four year program registration.

Psychological support deals with those elements related to satisfaction, involvement, morale, and ability to affect decisions. While these variables are less directly manipulatable than those of the logistical support system, nevertheless they did play a strong part in the total group process.

A majority of the participants indicated that they participated in the decision making process as much as they wished and were generally satisfied with their involvement and that of others in setting the objectives. Strongly related to a four year program registration was the fact that the designers were allowed initiative to and had autonomy in working on the design process and also that they approved of CBTE.

The respondents indicated in a majority of cases that they understood their role and that of others. The designers ranked as positive in the process the fact that the design roles were identified in advance and the designers were held accountable for these roles. Also of importance was the fact that the design group members liked to work together.

In terms of the ability to affect decisions, a majority of the respondents felt that they had power to influence decisions in terms of educational policy and decisions of the consortium. A majority were positive in that they could influence the design of the CBTE plan.

A factor which was negative to the process was that the designers felt they were not adequately rewarded by their institutions for their design efforts.

A majority of the respondents indicated that the leadership was psychologically supportive in that the leaders expressed concern for members' views on CBTE, spent adequate time with the groups and supported their design efforts. Positively related to four year program registration were the facts that leaders met every meeting, and gave sufficient assistance to work groups.

A second concern dealt with in the total project is the types of external relationships that develop in order to effect institutional change. What is meant by "external" in this case is those outside of the IHE rather than outside of the consortium. One of these "external relationships" is with the State Education Department. Due to the fact that this was the agency responsible for the initiation of the change in teacher certification, the relationship to the IHE is of special importance. (The State Education Department -- IHE relationship was investigated in a separate report, see Appendix

for a summary) The respondents indicated that the State Education Department had not set up many CBTE design rules/procedures to assist the design efforts.

As explained previously, the mandate required that the IHE, the school administrators, and representatives of the local teachers work together on the CBTE proposal. As a result of the mandate, a political question surfaced in regard to who was to control the access and certification of the teaching profession. This study did not directly investigate the relationship of the IHE and the school administrators. It seems that at least in the majority of cases, this was not where the controversy arose.

The relationship between the representatives of the local teachers, usually defined as teachers unions, and the IHE was investigated. The unions were more vocal regarding this issue and brought many critical and controversial issues to the forefront. It was found that those IHE's which were affiliated with cooperative unions, were more likely to receive a four year program registration.

Another of the initial concerns dealt with in the study is the "extent to which an institution defines its problems and seeks assistance in the solution of these problems." With regard to decision making, a majority of the respondents indicated that there was a defined decision making process and structure. Decisions to be made were identified by the

consortium and problems were identified before solutions were put forth. Also, before any evaluation took place, all of the solutions were presented to the group. Thus, what emerged was a systematic process through which the consortium defined the decisions to be made and worked at their solution.

The discussion of the concern about kinds of technical assistance which follows also develops directly out of this same problem definition and assistance for solution framework. The fact that the consortium sought to outline its resources available for working to meet the mandate and to find those not already there, indicates that the participants defined and sought solutions to their problems.

Two concerns evolved into the focus of one report. "The kinds of technical assistance that seem useful in order to effect institutional change" and "the types of assistance that an institution finds useful in the course of changing its methods of preparing teachers" were investigated primarily in the technical assistance section of the total project.

This document identified seven types of technical assistance: (1) consultants, (2) internal training, (3) external training, (4) conferences, (5) general materials, (6) skill training, and (7) other types. Questionnaire items sought to identify the frequency of use and effectiveness of these types of assistance in relation to the concept of CBTE, the New York State mandate and the preparation of CBTE programs.

For many institutions of higher education, the New York State mandate was a very unexpected directive both in terms of the deadline and the exclusive nature of the CBTE mode. All IHE's were forced to assess their resources and available knowledge in order to seek help in preparing a new teacher education program. The types of technical assistance sought and their usefulness as rated by respondents, reveals areas of perceived weakness and the kinds of support the IHE's identified as important as they sought to make the changes in their teacher education program.

The results of the Technical Assistance Report extend and substantiate points made in other sections. In general, assistance in the category "other" was rated most highly effective by respondents. Mentioned as specifically helpful were informal discussions, information from the State Education Department, and other one-to-one information exchange opportunities. In light of the fact that these elements relate to four year program registration, it seems that interactive situations are important factors in the informal communication network.

Internal training (training led by groups/persons on the staff) was rated effective in gaining CBTE information and in preparing a CBTE program. The findings of the organizational change report also recommend inservice training for program designers. Additionally, those IHE's that had staff members

with experience in designing and implementing CBTE programs tended to more frequently receive four year program registration. Therefore, from a technical assistance standpoint, developing a knowledgeable and experienced staff to serve as a core unit for internal service training and to facilitate informal technical information exchange can be a substantially important factor in leading to an effective CBTE program.

Policy Recommendations

The focus of this study was to identify organizational change elements common among institutions of higher education (IHE) in response to a statewide mandate for competence based teacher education. From the findings previously summarized, a number of implications for policy formation seem apparent. There are two groups to which these recommendations are addressed, i.e., those which relate to the state agency issuing the directive for change and those related to the institutions confronted by this directive. These recommendations do not relate to the wisdom of the particular mandate issued in New York State nor to the desirability of competence based teacher education but rather to the general process of organizational change.

When a state agency has decided that certain changes are desirable, there are two directions which may be taken. The state agency may encourage institutions to move in the direction of the desired change or may mandate that the desired change be accomplished. The situation in New York State was of the second type, i.e., mandated change. Given the information from the present study, the fact of the mandate caused many problems; much conflict and resentment was generated. Thus, based on this study, it is strongly recommended that state agencies not mandate their proposed change to competence based teacher education. Once the choice is made, however, to bring about the change, there are some fairly clear lessons which may be learned from the experience in New York State in the change

to CBTE.

First of importance in this regard is that some acceptance for the idea behind the change be built up. In the case of New York State, the mandate was issued before the necessary acceptance for the idea was gained, before CBTE was firmly established as a positive method by which to train teachers. It is recommended that the state agency closely study the change proposed and its implications and make this information publicly known. Perhaps a pilot project which documented the merits, as well as the problems, would be a good way in which to proceed. Regardless of the method chosen, it is clear that if acceptance of the idea behind the change is gained, the change will be easier to bring about.

Once the directive for change is issued, the state agency should have a firm statement of exactly what the change is to be, what it means in great detail, what types of responses are expected and how these proposals will be evaluated, how the change will be implemented, and the types and sources of support which will be made available to assist institutions in meeting the change. In the case of New York State, as documented by this study, there was a great deal of confusion and lack of understanding and the institutions actually wondered if anyone really understood the situation. Thus, clearly this type of preliminary information issued by the state agency is of vital importance.

After the change process is initiated, communications take on added significance. The state agency should provide both

formal and informal means of communication and it should be a two way channel. In order to facilitate the process at every step, it is recommended that the state agency provide speakers who could go to the IHEs upon request to answer questions. promote discussion, provide any new information; in general, to aid the institutions in any way possible. Perhaps a newsletter from the state agency which provided similar kinds of information would be useful.

Another form of communication which is recommended is the establishment by the state agency of networks for inter-institutional information exchange. Many of the respondents indicated that they might have benefited by information exchange with other institutions involved in the same process. Therefore, communication among the institutions with the involvement of the state agency is also recommended.

The proposals in New York State were treated confidentially. Many institutions wondered about the process of evaluation and what factors might be involved in the process. Therefore, it is recommended that the program proposals be made public by the state agency, i.e., available to other institutions also submitting proposals. In this way, the secretive nature of the evaluating agency would be changed and also communication facilitated. The IHEs would be aware of other's mistakes as well as their successes and thereby could write a stronger proposal.

As the financial summary indicated, little money was available for institutions to use as they worked toward program

development. At many institutions studied, the participants felt that some resources should have been made available for the purchase of instructional materials, to sponsor conferences, to reward those who gave so much time to writing the program proposals, etc. Therefore, when possible, the state agency should make some financial assistance available to each institution. This would not only facilitate those concerns already mentioned but would also show that the state agency wanted to offer help or assistance in many forms.

As indicated earlier, there are also a number of recommendations which can be made to the institutions confronted by the directive to change to CBTE. Once the state agency has made its initial statement about the change, whether mandated or not, the institution must decide upon its response. There are many possibilities. The institution can fight the directive for change, work for its modification, comply with it, ignore it, or even withdraw from the activity covered by the directive. Most of these responses were found in the various institutions in New York State as they dealt with the CBTE mandate and the response influenced their program proposals in various ways. To emphasize once again, however, while the fact of the mandate was significant in New York State, there are recommendations which can be made to help institutions prepare their programs even if not mandated.

As with the recommendations for the state agency, a crucial element in helping institutions comply with change is the establishment of strong communications networks. In the

previous section, it was emphasized that the state agency communicate with the institutions. The reverse obviously is true, i.e., the institutions keep communication channels open and readily seek to exchange information with the state agency.

Communication within the institution is also of vital importance. Since most of the participants who work to create the change are probably new to the task, it is essential that as much information as possible is made available and that they fully understand the goal and their own role in meeting it.

Therefore, an intra-institutional communications network should be established. Among the things which might be done are: setting up a responsible committee, making sure that an administrative leader with the authority to act meets regularly with such a committee, conducting regular workshop activities as well as business meetings for such a group, distributing minutes of all meetings, distributing reprints of relevant articles to all involved, supporting attendance of individuals at relevant conferences, seeking contact with persons at other institutions who have the same responsibility, and establishing a special purpose materials collection for the use of the committee. Thus, it is highly recommended that there are strong communication lines for the easy accessibility to information about CBTE.

Individual involvement and satisfaction are important factors in the process of change. It was found that a democratic decision model was strongly favored by the respondents.

It is recommended that the leaders especially take into account some elements of psychological support. Adequate feedback about the work being done is essential. Those responsible for a particular task in the change process should understand their role and should be allowed to participate in the decision making process. Individuals should be able to learn their roles and those of others in order to identify sources of knowledge and support relating to particular aspects of the change. Role definition also helps to clarify the tasks to be accomplished.

Administrative responsibility should be demonstrated by leaders through attending meetings and responding to communications. Both group and individual support should be given, such as providing materials and helpful information, clearing communications pathways between groups, facilitating group interaction, and being supportive of the change and the group's work to implement it.

As was documented earlier, the consortium model seemed to be a workable one in the process of change to competence based teacher education. In regard to the use of the consortium approach, the institutions need to develop the ability to operate in a negotiating situation. Previously, relationships among schools, colleges, and teacher representatives had not been in terms of a consortium model. Thus, while input from all groups affected by CBTE is important, it is recommended that some thought be given to the development of skills to work in such a negotiating situation.

Also related to the consortium membership is the fact that the IHEs had to deal with the unions. In many consortia this was a source of conflict. It is recommended, once again, that strong communications networks be set up and utilized to the fullest extent. A clear understanding of terms, interests, and goals between the unions and others involved is necessary.

Another step an institution can take in preparing for program change is to improve faculty knowledge and experience concerning the concept involved. This can be done by actively recruiting at least one staff member with the appropriate background. Also, through periodic meetings, conferences and workshops, a faculty can acquaint itself with many aspects of a proposal. Then, at the time of actual program development, attention can be focused on the problems of using the concept as a theoretical base for a program rather than on learning about the concept itself.

While massive program change should not be undertaken rapidly, it can be successfully accomplished by careful planning and wise use of available resources. The results of this study indicate which particular organizational techniques and material assistance do contribute to an effective CBTE program design.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Due to the wide variety of approaches taken throughout the state in developing the CBTE format, it is necessary to standardize the following terms to insure consistency in collection and interpretation of responses.

1. Consortium - The collective entity comprised of the agencies and institutions involved in developing the CBTE program. The consortia might include; Teachers' Unions, Community Organizations, Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), School Districts, etc.
2. Policy Board - Group which coordinates and/or directs the activities of the consortia membership as the CBTE format is developed. The Policy Board consists of representatives of the groups who participate in the Consortium.
3. Task Force - Group responsible specifically for the development of the program proposal. Task Force usually consists of members of the various organizations in the consortia who have an interest or expertise in a specific educational area. For instance, a Task Force on elementary education might consist of two faculty members from a university, three elementary school teachers, and two parents.
4. IHE - This refers to the Institution of Higher Education involved in the consortium.
5. Mandate - The provisions of Education Law #6842 and the criteria established by the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification which outlined the competency-based requirements for program registration with the State Education Department.
6. School District - School District involved in the consortium.
7. Professional Agency - This usually refers to the Teachers' Union involved in the consortium.
8. Program Proposal - Document submitted, by the IHE and consortia, to the State Education Department for registration.
9. Program Registration - Refers to the State Education Department's decision to register a program for one year or four years.

NOTE:

All programs and program proposals, forming the focal point of this study, were to be submitted to the State Education Department on or before February 1, 1975. These include:

N-6
Speech-Hearing
Special Education

Deaf
Blind
7-9

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Answer all questions on the basis of your involvement in the process of developing the CBTE program proposal submitted in February 1975.
2. If you served in developing two different program proposals i.e. N-6 and Special Education, try to limit your responses to those relevant to the specific program in question.
3. We are interested in your perceptions of the roles played by yourself and others. Respondents' identities will not be recorded.

This document contains the following sub-sections.

1. Leadership
2. Decision Making
3. Technical Assistance
4. Process Environment
5. Organizational Change

DECISION MAKING

1. Who first called Policy Board together?

title:

2. The final decisions regarding the composition of the Policy Board were made by:

title:

3. Decisions relating to the specific content of the CBTE programs were made by:

title:

4. Decisions regarding the operating procedures of the consortium were made by:

title:

5. Decisions regarding the process for final sign off on the proposal document were made by:

title:

6. I participated in the consortium decision making process by:
(Check any response which applies)

- ☐ a. exchanging information
- ☐ b. developing solutions to problems
- ☐ c. selecting solutions to problems
- ☐ d. implementing solutions to problems
- ☐ e. evaluating solutions to problems

	Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree	
8. The decision making style generally followed by the consortium could be best characterized as authoritarian.	1	2	3	4	5
9. As a member of the consortium I felt I had no power to influence decisions that were made.	1	2	3	4	5
10. As a member of the consortium I was called upon as often as I wished to participate in decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Consortium decisions were usually made without conflict.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The decision making style generally followed by the consortium could be best characterized as democratic.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Consortium decisions necessary to the proposal development task were clearly identified.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Consortium decisions were usually made expeditiously.	1	2	3	4	5
15. The consortium decision making structure was not defined at all.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The consortium decision making process was clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5
17. In the process of making decisions, the problem was usually defined clearly before solution ideas were presented.	1	2	3	4	5
18. In the process of making decisions, all solution ideas were presented before any were evaluated.	1	2	3	4	5
19. In the process of making decisions, the decision makers' hidden agendas were usually identified.	1	2	3	4	5
20. In the process of making decisions, consortium members were pressured to conform to the majority's decision.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree	
21. Consortium members spent more time on maintaining the consortium than on making consortium decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Decision rules were developed by the consortium to expedite the decision making process followed by the group.	1	2	3	4	5
23. The consortium decision making process had a feedback system built into it.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Before consortium decisions were made, members clearly identified who had the necessary information.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Before consortium decisions were made, members clearly identified what the necessary information was to resolve the problem.	1	2	3	4	5

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Some of the following questions may require additional pages. Please add where necessary.

1. Please check the group(s) in which you now serve and specify the additional information requested.

a) _____ CBTE Consortium

Please specify your constituency _____

b) _____ Task Force

Please identify your Task Force Group _____

c) _____ Other

Please describe _____

Please rate the level of your knowledge using a scale ranging from Low (1) to High (5) for the following questions.

2. How much did you know about the concept before your involvement in the preparation of CBTE programs? 1 2 3 4 5

3. How much do you now know about the concept of CBTE? 1 2 3 4 5

4. Please specify the motivation(s) which prompted you to seek knowledge about the concept of CBTE.

5. Which of the following did you use to secure information on the concept of CBTE and rate the degree of their usefulness using a scale from Low(1) to High (5) for each of the following.

- a) _____ Consultants
Persons used for advice, not
to be confused with persons
used for training purposes. 1 2 3 4 5
- b) _____ Internal Training
Training led by groups/persons
on the institutional staff. 1 2 3 4 5
- c) _____ External Training
Training led by groups/persons
outside the institutional
staff. 1 2 3 4 5
- d) _____ Conferences
Those informative sessions
not designed specifically
for a single institution. 1 2 3 4 5
- e) _____ General Materials
Those materials which in-
form the consumer concerning
theories, concepts, etc.
on CBTE. 1 2 3 4 5
- f) _____ Skill Training Materials
Those materials which explain
ways to perform certain tasks,
procedures, etc. on CBTE. 1 2 3 4 5
- g) _____ Other
Please specify _____
_____ 1 2 3 4 5

6. If you checked Consultants, please fill in the following for each Consultant.

- a) Who was the Consultant? _____
- b) How was this Consultant selected? _____

- c) Why was this Consultant selected? _____

- d) What organization did this consultant represent? _____

- e) What did the Consultant do? _____

f) What format did the Consultant use? _____

g) How often did you use this Consultant? _____

h) What was the cost of this Consultant? _____

i) Please rate the effectiveness of this Consultant using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

7. If you checked Internal Training, please fill in the following for each Internal Training Session.

a) What did the Internal Training consist of? _____

b) Why was this type of Internal Training chosen? _____

c) Who generated the need for this Internal Training? _____

d) Who directed the Internal Training? _____

e) What group did he/she represent? _____

f) How often did this particular Internal Training take place? _____

g) Where was the Internal Training held? _____

h) Who attended the Internal Training sessions? _____

i) What was the cost of the Internal Training? _____

j) Please rate the effectiveness of this Internal Training session using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

8. If you checked External Training, please fill in the following for each External Training Session.

- a) What did the External Training consist of? _____

- b) Why was this type of External Training chosen? _____

- c) Who generated the need for this External Training? _____

- d) Who directed the External Training? _____
- e) What group did he/she represent? _____
- f) How often did this particular External Training take place? _____
- g) Where was the External Training held? _____

- h) Who attended the External Training sessions? _____

- i) What was the cost of the External Training? _____
- j) Please rate the effectiveness of this External Training using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective.

1 2 3 4 5

9. If you checked Conferences, please fill in the following for each Conference.

- a) What was the title of the Conference? _____
- b) How was this Conference selected? _____

- c) Why was this Conference selected? _____

- d) What group directed the Conference? _____

e) Briefly describe the contents of the conference.

f) What was the purpose of the Conference? _____

g) Where was the conference held? _____

h) Please state who attended the conference and what group in the preparation of CBTE programs they represented.

Name _____ Group _____

Name _____ Group _____

Name _____ Group _____

i) What was the total cost of this conference? _____

j) Please rate the effectiveness of this conference using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

10. If you checked General Materials, please fill in the following for each group of General Materials.

a) What was the title of the materials? _____

b) How were these materials selected? _____

c) Why were these materials selected? _____

d) What was the source of these materials? _____

e) How were these materials used? _____

- f) What was the cost of these materials? _____
- g) Please rate the effectiveness of these General Materials using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

11. If you checked Skill Training Materials, please fill in the following for each group of skill training materials.

- a) What was the title of the materials? _____

- b) How were these materials selected? _____

- c) Why were these materials selected? _____

- d) What was the source of these materials? _____

- e) How were these materials used? _____

- f) What was the cost of these materials? _____
- g) Please rate the effectiveness of these Skill Training Materials using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

12. If you checked Other, please fill in the following for each specified Other.

- a) What method was employed? _____

- b) Why was this method selected? _____

- c) Who suggested the employment of this method? _____

- d) What group did the person who suggested this method represent? _____
- e) Who directed the employment of this method? _____
- f) What group did the person who directed this method represent? _____
- g) Please rate the effectiveness of this Method using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

Please rate the level of your knowledge using a scale ranging from Low (1) to High (5) for the following two questions.

13. How much did you know about the N.Y. State Mandate for CBTE before your involvement in the preparation of CBTE programs?

1 2 3 4 5

14. How much do you now know about the N.Y. State Mandate for the preparation of CBTE programs?

1 2 3 4 5

15. Please specify the motivation(s) which prompted you to seek knowledge about the N.Y. State Mandate for the preparation of CBTE programs.

16. Which of the following did you use to secure information on the New York State Mandate, and rate the degree of their usefulness using a scale from Low(1) to High (5) for the following questions.

a)	_____ Consultants	1	2	3	4	5
b)	_____ Internal Training	1	2	3	4	5
c)	_____ External Training	1	2	3	4	5
d)	_____ Conference	1	2	3	4	5
e)	_____ General Materials	1	2	3	4	5
f)	_____ Skill Training Materials	1	2	3	4	5
g)	_____ Other (Please specify)	1	2	3	4	5

19. If you checked External Training, please fill in the following for each External Training Session.

- a) What did the External Training consist of? _____

- b) Why was this type of External Training chosen? _____

- c) Who generated the need for this External Training? _____

- d) Who directed the External Training? _____

- e) What group did he/she represent? _____
- f) How often did this particular External Training take place? _____
- g) Where was the External Training held? _____

- h) Who attended the External Training sessions? _____

- i) What was the cost of the External Training? _____
- j) Please rate the effectiveness of this External Training session using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

20. If you checked Conferences, please fill in the following for each conference.

- a) What was the title of the Conference? _____
- b) How was this Conference selected? _____

- c) Why was this Conference selected? _____

- d) What group directed the Conference? _____

- e) Briefly describe the contents of the Conference? _____

- f) What was the purpose of the Conference? _____

- g) Where was the Conference held? _____

- h) Please state who attended the Conference and what group
in the preparation of CBTE programs they represented.
Name _____ Group _____
Name _____ Group _____
- i) What was the total cost of this Conference? _____

- j) Please rate the effectiveness of this Conference using
a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).
1 2 3 4 5

21. If you checked General Materials, please fill in the following for
each group of General Materials.

- a) What was the title of the materials? _____

- b) How were these materials selected? _____

- c) Why were these materials selected? _____

- d) What was the source of these materials? _____

- f) What was the cost of these materials? _____
- g) Please rate the effectiveness of these General Materials using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).
- 1 2 3 4 5

22. If you checked Skill Training Materials, please fill in the following for each group of Skill Training Materials.

- a) What was the title of the materials? _____
- b) How were these materials selected? _____
- c) Why were these materials selected? _____
- d) What was the source of these materials? _____
- e) How were these materials used? _____
- f) What was the cost of these materials? _____
- g) Please rate the effectiveness of these Skill Training Materials using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).
- 1 2 3 4 5

23. If you checked Other, please fill in the following for each specified Other.

- a) What method was employed? _____
- b) Why was this method selected? _____

- c) Who suggested the employment of this method? _____

- d) What group did the person who suggested this method represent? _____
- e) Who directed the employment of this method? _____

- f) What group did the person who directed this method represent? _____
- g) Please rate the effectiveness of this method using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).
- 1 2 3 4 5

Please rate the level of your knowledge using a scale ranging from Low (1) to High (5) for the following two questions.

24. How much did you know about the preparation of CBTE programs before your involvement in their preparation?
- 1 2 3 4 5
25. How much do you know about the preparation of CBTE programs?
- 1 2 3 4 5
26. Please specify the motivation(s) which prompted you to seek knowledge about the preparation of CBTE programs.

27. Which of the following did you use to secure information on the preparation of CBTE programs and rate the degree of their usefulness using a scale from Low(1) to High(5) for the following six questions.

- a) _____ Consultants
- 1 2 3 4 5
- b) _____ Internal Training
- 1 2 3 4 5
- c) _____ External Training
- 1 2 3 4 5

- d) _____ Conferences
- 1 2 3 4 5
- e) _____ General Materials
- 1 2 3 4 5
- f) _____ Skill Training Materials
- 1 2 3 4 5
- g) _____ Other
Please specify _____
- 1 2 3 4 5

28. If you checked Consultants, please fill in the following for each Consultant.

- a) Who was the Consultant? _____
- b) How was this Consultant selected? _____
- c) Why was this Consultant selected? _____
- d) What organization did this Consultant represent? _____
- e) What did the Consultant do? _____
- f) What format did the Consultant use? _____
- g) How often did you use this Consultant? _____
- h) What was the cost of this Consultant? _____

- i) Please rate the effectiveness of this Consultant using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

29. If you checked Internal Training, please fill in the following for each Internal Training Session.

- a) What did the Internal Training consist of? _____

- b) Why was this type of Internal Training chosen? _____

- c) Who generated the need for this Internal Training? _____

- d) Who directed the Internal Training? _____
- e) What group did he/she represent? _____
- f) How often did this particular Internal Training take place? _____
- g) Where was the Internal Training held? _____

- h) Who attended the Internal Training sessions? _____

- i) What was the cost of the Internal Training? _____
- j) Please rate the effectiveness of this Internal Training Session using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

30. If you checked External Training, please fill in the following for each External Training Session.

- a) What did the External Training consist of? _____

- b) Why was this type of External Training chosen? _____

- c) Who generated the need for this External Training?

- d) Who directed the External Training? _____
- e) What group did he/she represent? _____
- f) How often did this particular External Training take place? _____
- g) Where was the External Training held? _____

- h) Who attended the External Training sessions? _____

- i) What was the cost of the External Training? _____
- j) Please rate the effectiveness of this External Training using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

31. If you checked Conferences, please fill in the following for each Conference.

- a) What was the title of the Conference? _____
- b) How was this Conference selected? _____

- c) Why was this Conference selected? _____

- d) What group directed the Conference? _____

- e) Briefly describe the contents of the conference?

- f) What was the purpose of the Conference? _____

- g) Where was the conference held? _____
- h) Please state who attended the conference and what group in the preparation of CBTE programs they represented.
- Name _____ Group _____
- Name _____ Group _____
- Name _____ Group _____
- i) What was the total cost of this conference? _____
- j) Please rate the effectiveness of this conference using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).
- 1 2 3 4 5

32. If you checked General Materials, please fill in the following for each group of General Materials.

- a) What was the title of the materials? _____
- _____
- b) How were these materials selected? _____
- _____
- c) Why were these materials selected? _____
- _____
- d) What was the source of these materials? _____
- _____
- e) How were these materials used? _____
- _____
- f) What was the cost of these materials? _____
- g) Please rate the effectiveness of these General Materials using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).
- 1 2 3 4 5

33. If you checked Skill Training Materials, please fill in the following for each group of Skill Training Materials.

- a) What was the title of the materials? _____

- b) How were these materials selected? _____

- c) Why were these materials selected? _____

- d) What was the source of these materials? _____

- e) How were these materials used? _____

- f) What was the cost of these materials? _____
- g) Please rate the effectiveness of these Skill Training Materials using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

34. If you checked Other, please fill in the following for each specified Other.

- a) What method was employed? _____

- b) Why was this method selected? _____

- c) Who suggested the employment of this method? _____

- d) What group did the person who suggested this method represent? _____
- e) Who directed the employment of this method? _____

- f) What group did the person who directed this method represent? _____
- g) Please rate the effectiveness of this method using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

PROCESS ENVIRONMENT

1. Please list the objectives as you see them of the group(s) to which you belong.

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____
e) _____

2. Who (persons and their representative positions) was involved in establishing the objectives?

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____
e) _____

3. Were you involved in establishing these objectives? YES ____
NO ____

Please indicate the degree of your involvement in establishing these objectives (circle the correct number)

No Involvement
1 2

3

High Involvement
4 5

Please explain your involvement.

4. Please indicate the degree to which you were satisfied with your involvement in establishing these objectives. (Circle one)

Low Satisfaction

1

2

3

High Satisfaction

4

5

Please explain your choice.

5. Please indicate the degree of your satisfaction with the involvement of other people in establishing these objectives. (Circle one)

Low Satisfaction

1

2

3

High Satisfaction

4

5

Please explain your choice.

6. Please indicate the degree of your satisfaction with the objectives of the group to which you belong.

Low Satisfaction

1

2

3

High Satisfaction

4

5

Please explain your choice.

7. Have the initial objectives of your group been changed in any way (i.e., after the group had been in operation for a while)? YES ____ NO ____

If YES: a) How have the objectives been changed?

b) Why have they been changed?

c) Who was involved in modifying the objectives?

8. Please list the objectives of the CBTE Mandate as you initially understood them.

1)

2)

3)

9. Please indicate the degree of your satisfaction with the objectives of the CBTE Mandate.

Low Satisfaction

1

2

3

High Satisfaction

4

5

Please explain your choice.

10. As you understand them have the initial interpretations of the CBTE Mandate been changed in any way (i.e., after the consortium had been in operation for a while)? YES ____ NO ____

11. If YES:
- a) How has the interpretation of the objectives been changed?
 - b) Why has it been changed?
 - c) Who was involved in reinterpreting the objectives? (List persons and representative positions)

12. How was the consortium initially organized?

13. What constituencies did the membership represent?

14. After actual functioning, has the proposed organization of the consortium been revised? YES ___ NO ___

If YES:

- a) How does it differ?

- b) Who was involved in modifying the original organization? (Persons and representative positions)

- c) Why do you think this change occurred?

15. In your opinion were all of the groups affected by CBTE (i.e., teachers, unions, administrators, university faculty, etc.) represented by membership within the consortium (Policy Board/task groups)? YES ___ NO ___

16. If YES: 1) Why do you have this opinion?

2) What changes would you make in the representations?

3) How would you make these changes?

4) Do you feel it would be possible to make the changes you propose?

17. If NO: 1) Which groups were excluded?

2) Why do you feel that they were excluded?

3) What changes would you make in the representations?

4) Do you feel it would be possible to make the changes which you propose?

18. Do you feel you had any effect on important policy matter(s) related to CBTE?

If YES: 1) What specific policy matter(s) did you affect?

2) How did this occur?

3) What changes would you make?

17. If you checked Consultants, please fill in the following for each Consultant.

- a) Who was the Consultant? _____
- b) How was this Consultant selected? _____

- c) Why was this Consultant selected? _____

- d) What organization did this Consultant represent? _____

- e) What did the Consultant do? _____

- f) What format did the Consultant use? _____

- g) How often did you use this Consultant? _____
- h) What was the cost of this Consultant? _____
- i) Please rate the effectiveness of this Consultant using a scale from Not Very Effective (1) to Very Effective (5).

1 2 3 4 5

18. If you checked Internal Training, please fill in the following for each Internal Training Session.

- a) What did the Internal Training consist of? _____

- b) Why was this type of Internal Training chosen? _____

- c) Who generated the need for this Internal Training? _____

- d) Who directed the Internal Training? _____
- e) What group did he/she represent? _____
- f) How often did this particular Internal Training take place? _____

4) How would you make these changes?

5) Do you feel it would be possible to make the changes which you propose? Why or why not?

19. If NO: 1) Why do you feel you had no effect?

20. Do you feel others had an important effect on policy matter(s) related to CBTE? YES ___ NO ___

If YES: 1) Please list persons (and their representative positions) whom you feel most affected policy matters (Add additional lines if you need them.)

- a) _____
- b) _____
- c) _____
- d) _____
- e) _____

2) How did the above people effect policy matters?

- a) _____
- b) _____
- c) _____
- d) _____
- e) _____

3) In what policy matters were the above persons effective?

- a) _____
- b) _____
- c) _____
- d) _____
- e) _____

21. If NO: Please explain why you feel this way.

22. Do you feel that you understand your role as a member of the consortium (policy board, task groups)?

If YES: 1) Briefly explain your role as you see it.

2) How did you learn this role? i.e. How did you learn your duties and responsibilities? Did anyone tell you about them?

23. If NO: 1) Why do you think you do not understand your role?

2) Do you think anything should be done to change this?

3) Do you think anything can be done to change this?

24. In your opinion do others respond to you in your role as you see it? YES ___ NO ___

If YES: What makes you think this?

25. If NO: 1) Why don't they respond to you in your role as you see it?

2) Do you think anything should be done to change this?

3) Do you think anything can be done to change this?

26. As a member of the Policy Board and/or task group, do (did) you discuss with others how they and you feel about the mandate, proposals, goals, policy, etc.?

If YES: 1) What feelings were (are) discussed?

2) What difference does (did) the discussion make?

3) How did the discussion occur?

4) Please give an example(s) of a discussion which you believe made a difference?

27. If you did not engage in discussion, please explain why not.

28. What sources of information on CBTE were (are) available in in your institution for your use (e.g., written materials, conferences, lectures, consulting services, etc.)?

29. Did you ever make use of any of these sources of information?

YES ____ NO ____

If YES: 1) Which sources did you use?

2) How did you choose the information you used?

3) For what purpose did you use the information?

4) Please indicate the degree to which you think the information you acquired on CBTE was useful to your understanding of what CBTE is about.

Useless

1

2

3

4

Very Useful

5

Explain your choice.

- 5) Please indicate the degree of difficulty with which you obtained information on CBTE.

Very Difficult					Easy
1	2	3	4	5	

Explain your choice.

30. If NO: Why haven't you used any sources of information?

31. Are there any established procedures by which information is passed on from the Policy Board to the task groups and the task groups to the Policy Board at your institution? YES ___ NO ___

If YES: What are they?

32. If NO: In your opinion, why isn't information passed back and forth between the Policy Board and task groups?

33. Do members of different task groups communicate with one another in your institution? YES ___ NO ___
DON'T KNOW ___

If YES: How does communication between them occur?

34. If NO: Why isn't there any communication?

35. Do any other established (formal) ways exist within your consortium by which you can obtain information on what goes on, e.g., at Policy Board meetings in relation to CBTE and the State Education Mandate? If so, what are they? (e.g., meetings, inter-group memos, etc.)

36. Are there any other informal ways you can get information about what is going on within the consortium? If so, what are they?

37. Please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with the formal available ways of obtaining information.

Low Satisfaction

1

2

3

4

High Satisfaction

5

Explain your choice.

38. Please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with the informal available ways of obtaining information.

Low Satisfaction

1

2

3

4

High Satisfaction

5

Explain your choice.

39. Would you make any changes in relation to how information on what is going on is obtained within your consortium? YES ___ NO ___

If YES: What changes?

Do you think it is possible to make these changes?

YES ___

NO ___

Explain

Perception of CBTE

40. What did you think about CBTE when you first found out about it?

41. Have you since then made use of or have been involved in any of the below (Please check off)?

Various sources of information on CBTE ____

Involvement with the Policy Board ____

Involvement in task group(s) ____

42. If you have made use of available information on CBTE or have been involved in the workshops of the Policy Board and/or task group(s), have any of these experiences added to your understanding of CBTE? YES ____ NO ____

Explain.

43. What is your opinion of CBTE now?

44. Did the faculty governing body (i.g., Senate) take any stand on the CBTE Mandate? YES ____ NO ____

If YES: What stand did it take?

45. Did the local teacher's union take any stand on CBTE? YES ____ NO ____

If YES: What was this stand?

How did you find out about this stand?

46. How would you rank the power of local teachers' union(s)?
(For each Union)

	Very Strong				Weak
Union 1	5	4	3	2	1
Union 2	5	4	3	2	1
Union 3	5	4	3	2	1
Union 4	5	4	3	2	1
Union 5	5	4	3	2	1

Add more if necessary.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Not Applicable	Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. CBTE should provide information for decision makers to decide whether a teaching candidate has sufficient competence to teach.	1	2	3	4	5					
2. I approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5					
3. Members of the task force were given an inservice training program which was useful in helping them design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
4. There were many rules and procedures describing the task force's role in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
5. Members of the task force were able to influence the educational policies/decisions made by the consortium group.	1	2	3	4	5					
6. The task force leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5					
7. CBTE is a more rational, systematic methods for training teachers than the methods presently in use in most training organizations.	1	2	3	4	5					
8. Administrators in this consortium's IHE approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5					
9. Sufficient assistance was given to the task force a designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
10. The State Education Department set up many rules and procedures for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
11. I was able to influence the educational policies decisions made by the task force.	1	2	3	4	5					
12. The task leader supported my efforts to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
13. The task force leader approves of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5					
14. The task force was given an orientation session which was useful in helping me understand the requirements involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
15. I had to communicate with the other members of the task force to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
16. I was able to influence the educational policies/decisions made by the policy board.	1	2	3	4	5					

Not applicable		Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree	
17.	The task force leader spent adequate time with me in helping me design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5
18.	CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers than the methods presently in use in most training institutions.	1	2	3	4 5
19.	Members of the task force approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4 5
20.	Sufficient funds were made available to the consortium for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5
21.	I had to communicate with the task force leader to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5
22.	I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan for this IHE.	1	2	3	4 5
23.	The task force leader provided information about how to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5
24.	CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4 5
25.	School district administrators in this consortium approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4 5
26.	I received feedback from others in regard to my performance/role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5
27.	I had to communicate with administrators of the IHE to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5
28.	I like to work with the members of the task force.	1	2	3	4 5
29.	The task force leader provided me with the necessary kinds of assistance for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5
30.	CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1	2	3	4 5
31.	Should teachers' unions in this consortium approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4 5
32.	I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my performance/role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5
33.	I had to communicate with members of the policy board to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5
34.	Communication among task force members focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4 5

Not Applicable	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree			
35. Administrators in this consortium's IHE were concerned with the task force thought about CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
36. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective school performance by students.	1	2	3	4	5
37. The initial results of CBTE in other states have been positive in terms of their positive effect on the preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Decisions about what to put into the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I had little freedom to control the events that influenced the design of a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
41. Administrators in this consortium's IHE supported the task force's efforts to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
42. The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1	2	3	4	5
43. The principles and components of CBTE are difficult to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Decisions about how to design the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1	2	3	4	5
45. I was allowed little initiative in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
46. Administrators in this consortium's IHE spent adequate time with the task force in helping it design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
47. The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
48. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan for this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Decisions about how to design the CBTE plan were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1	2	3	4	5
50. There were conflicting expectations held about the task force's role in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5

Not Applicable	Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree		
51. I was held accountable for my role in working to design a CBTE plan for the consortium.	1	2	3	4	5
52. Communication between the task force and the administrators of the focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
53. Administrators in this consortium's IHE provided information about how to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
54. The CBTE plan which designed by our task force should provide information for decision makers to decide whether a teaching candidate has sufficient competence to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
55. It was easy to design a CBTE plan for this consortium.	1	2	3	4	5

Not Applicable		Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree				
_____	56. Decisions about what to put into the CBTE plan were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	57. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	58. As a task force member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	59. Administrators in this consortium's IHE provided the task force with the necessary kinds of assistance for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	60. The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers than the method presently in use in this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	61. When details of CBTE were first presented to the task force, the objectives of CBTE were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	62. As a task force member, I participated to the extent that I desired in making decisions about the design of a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	63. When details of CBTE were first presented to the task force, research finding about the effects of CBTE in training teachers were not mentioned.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	64. The task force was not kept well informed on the decisions and actions taken by the policy board in setting up a framework for the consortium.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	65. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan for this IHE were clearly defined by the policy board.	1	2	3	4	5					
_____	67. Task force meetings were scheduled when problems were encountered in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5					

APPENDIX C

In addition to professional staff time, the IHE's also provided meeting facilities and clerical assistance to the Policy Board.

Given the nature of the data and the various methods of accounting for time and cost of personnel involved in the CBTE activity, it is not possible to report specific costs. It is clear, however, that the CBTE effort was financed entirely by the IHE's and participating school districts. No state funds were available for the activity.

Because the activity was financed by the IHE's and school districts, no new money was devoted to the activity. Rather, the IHE's and the school districts contributed existing staff resources on a part time basis as needed. Said more simply, the development of the CBTE program was no one's full time activity and responsibility. It was rather an added-on activity and responsibility.

prepared by.....

Dr. Nicholas DeLuca

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Adelphi University
SUNY Albany
Alfred University
SUC Brockport
Dowling College
Fordham University
Ithaca College
Keuka College
Kirkland College

CUNY Herbert H. Lehman
LIU Southampton
Marymount College
Nazareth College
SUC New Paltz
SUC Potsdam
St. John's University
Syracuse University
Vassar College

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY CATEGORY

Program Registration	Type of Institution	Number of Responding Institutions
1 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
4 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
1 and 4 year program registration	Public	1
	Private	1

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ON CONSORTIUM MEMBERSHIP, PARTIAL SAMPLE**

Instit.	Public or Private	Prog. Certi- fied	POLICY BOARD						TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP				
			Total Pol- icy Bd. Membership	IHE Repr.	Prof. Agency Repre.	School Dist. Repre.	No. of Sch. Dist. in Consort.	Others	Total Task Force	IHE Repre.	Prof. Agency Repre.	School Dist. Repre.	Others
A	Pbc.	Elem.'	32	14	4	10	10	1	12	2	0	10	0
B	Pbc.	Elem.'	20	10	3	7	7	0	10	10	0	0	0
C	Pvt.	Elem.'	19	7	0	12	6	0	19*	7	0	12	0
D	Pvt.	Elem.'	7	4	2	1	1	0	10	3	5	2	0
E	Pvt.	Elem.'	13	5	0	6	3	2	13*	5	0	6	2
F	Pvt.	Elem.'	27	7	10	10	13	0	27*	7	10	10	0
G	Pvt.	Elem.'	10	4	3	3	3	0	10*	4	3	3	0
H	Pbc.	Speech "	21	7	7	7	7	0	10	2	4	1	3
I	Pvt.	Elem."	8		0	4	1	0	8*	4	0	4	0
J	Pvt.	Elem."	14	4	5	3	2	0	14*	4	5	3	0
K	Pbc.	Spec. Ed'	9	3	3	3	2	0	15	9	2	2	2
L	Pvt.	Elem.'	13	4	3	3	3	3	8	8	0	0	0

NOTES: Pbc. = Public
Pvt. = Private
" = same group as Policy Board

' one year program registration
" four year program registration

** made available by only 12 responding IHE's

APPENDIX D

Financial Summary

Each of the institutions participating in this study was asked a series of questions about the financing of the Competence-Based Teacher Education program development activity. Fourteen institutions responded to the questions.

None of the fourteen institutions received any state or federal monies for the CBTE program development activity. One public institution had received \$10,000 from the State Education Department to develop an experimental CBTE program during the three years (1972-1974) prior to the mandate. Another public institution had received a private foundation grant to develop alternative teacher education training models that were competence based.

Financial support for the CBTE development activity came entirely from the institutions of higher education and the participating school districts. The support almost always was in the form of "in kind" services. That is, personnel were assigned to CBTE tasks as part of their regular institutional role. The same was true of school district representatives. Their services were part of their assigned responsibilities in the districts. The districts paid their salaries and the salaries of substitute teachers when the latter was necessary.

Six of the fourteen IHE's budgeted modest sums for travel and expenses. They ranged from \$200 to \$5000.

APPENDIX E

Characteristics of Responding Consortia by Program Registration

The characteristics listed here are those resulting from the data analyses of the five project reports.

One Year Program Registration

low knowledge of CBTE before program development, high knowledge after

sources of technical assistance rated more effective than responses from four year program consortia

general materials and consultants provided the best information about the mandate

assistance in program preparation rated very useful

motivation in program preparation characterized by genuine interest and commitment to CBTE

Four Year Program Registration

high knowledge of CBTE before program development, high knowledge after

more types of technical assistance were less than useful in providing information

internal training provided the best information on the mandate

assistance in program preparation rated least useful

formal communication network reported helpful

pertinent information was characterized as highly available

resistance to the mandate was low

relationship with teachers' representatives characterized as cooperative

the consortia reported less internal conflict than those receiving 1 year registration

decision making was reported as democratic and expeditious

One Year
Program Registration

most consortia were from large, public colleges that

- had a large consortia membership
- had a higher degree of internal conflict
- had a conflict with public schools
- had several layers of stratification

Four Year
Program Registration

participants felt a pressure to conform to consortia decisions

participants felt their contributions were given proper attention

the communication network provided feedback to groups and individuals

most consortia were from small, private colleges that

- had a small consortia membership
- had a more open decision making style
- had less conflict
- were less formally organized
- had harmony with participating public schools
- had one level in consortia organization

APPENDIX F

Summary: "A Descriptive Profile of Individuals Applying for Certification through Individual Review Procedures" by Tolbert and Clark

When an agency grants certification on the basis of education, the criteria are easily designed. In the case of New York State certifying teachers, successful completion of an approved course of study warranted the certificate. As New York State moves toward a competency-based mode of teacher education, new criteria need to be devised for the assessment of competent performance. While this might be done by the colleges and universities in New York State for students enrolled in approved programs, the question of how to deal with those seeking certification outside approved programs must be dealt with. This study attempted to characterize the users of New York State's current Individual Review Procedure, in order to provide a data base for its revision in light of CBTE program changes.

Results of the study showed that women comprised 68% of those seeking certification through individual review. Many applicants have completed courses and/or degrees in New York State, and almost all applicants reside east of the Mississippi. Of the 868 non-residents in the sample, approximately 15% have obtained jobs in schools in New York. Responses to a questionnaire revealed that applicants for individual review would be willing to undergo 3-6 days of assessment activities, at a personal cost of from \$150 to \$250.

52

These and the other findings of the project characterize the people who are using the Individual Review Procedure. By ascertaining the needs and status of current applicants, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification can better plan to meet the needs of future applicants.

Summary: "Factors Affecting CBTE Program Development as Reported by Institutions and the New York State Education Department" by David Rostetter

This study documents the perceived difficulties of institutions of higher education and the critical problems in CBTE program development as perceived by the New York State Education Department. Additionally, the process utilized by the State Education Department in making decisions regarding assigning one or four year registration to program proposals is documented. Lastly, a comparison of the perceptions of the State Education Department and those of the institutions preparing programs is drawn.

Data for this study was gathered through a review of program proposals and SED comments, when permission was obtained from institutions. Also, interviews with those involved in both preparing and reviewing programs were conducted, and all available materials (guidelines, directives, informational correspondence, etc.) were investigated.

This study concludes that assessment of teacher competencies and their evaluation were perceived as the most difficult elements of CBTE program development by both institutions and SED. Secondly, the collaboration in program development required by SED (among institutions of higher education, public school administrators and teachers' representatives) seemed to be an

unrealistic demand upon the institutions of higher education given the differing interests and professional concerns of the three groups involved.

A summary section of the report synthesizes the project findings and offers implications for agencies planning wide reaching program change.

Summary: "A Case Study in CBTE Program Development from the Perspective of Inter and Intra Organizational Conflict" by David Rostetter

This study represents an indepth analysis of one institution's response to the CBTE mandate. Four teacher training institutions, each with a long history of teacher preparation, did not file a revised program with the State Education Department and the institution in this study represents one of these four. The main focus is the factors involved in the development of a CBTE program viewed from the perspective of intra and inter organizational conflict. The methodology employed was interviews and the study of documents available from the institution.

The questions which served to organize the information dealt with the acts of the participants, the activities engaged in by groups, meanings attributed to the acts and actions, level of involvement of participants, relationship of individuals and groups, and the setting in the development of a CBTE program. Most of the conclusions of the study dealt with the strong impact of mandated change and its effect in generating conflict. This conflict can be disruptive and lead to the failure to achieve desired goals. The second area from which conclusions were drawn was in regard to the distribution and exercise of power.

This study points up examples of the abuse, misuse and misconception of power. The importance of the case study lies in its implications for educational leaders who seek to gain insight into some of the processes involved in organizational change.

APPENDIX G

Model for Cooperative Research

On the basis of the experience gained from this project, a Model for Cooperative Research is proposed. The Model will be discussed in terms of its Components, Organization and Applications.

This Model has two basic components: a proposed research activity, and researchers. The research activity should center around a topic sufficiently broad to be of importance to those of different concerns within a specific field. The researchers should be able to investigate the topic from many viewpoints (i.e., philosophical, practical, administrative, social). Data should be obtainable from a wealth of available sources. Since, in a cooperative research effort the task of data collection and reporting will be shared by many, the project design should take into account the number of researchers and the possibilities for division of labor. This should allow for a larger study sample and hopefully more valid and more generalizable results.

The designers of a cooperative research project need have only one thing in common: a concern for the topic to be investigated. A shared background in the field from which the topic arose may be helpful. However, the project which gave rise to this model suggests that even when participants are from the same discipline (education) varying major areas of concern (educational sociology, curriculum development, educational administration and educational instruction) are strong enough to necessitate compromise, flexibility and individual

rather than whole group final reporting. Therefore, the background of the researchers cannot be viewed as a neutral factor.

The organization of a Model for Cooperative Research will to a certain extent vary from setting to setting. There are, however, some characteristics which remain constant. First, there is a need for an organizer. This person arranges for the physical needs of the group (meeting place, secretarial support, monitoring progress in light of deadlines and financial restraints) and can also serve as moderator for group meetings. While the researchers will make all substantive decisions democratically, there is a need for one person to be able to make decisions regarding routine procedures for the sake of efficiency. As moderator, this person should have the respect of the group, and should not let his/her particular part of the project, obscure the needs of the entire group.

A varied pattern of both whole group and committee meetings seems wise. Once major goals and other general issues are determined by all, individuals or small groups can design sections of the data collecting, devise to provide information pertinent to their specific purposes. While all items should be reviewed for consistency of language and general clarity, individual authors ought to have ultimate control over the gathering and analyses of data pertinent to their hypotheses.

Communication among researchers should be provided for, especially if they are not located near each other. During the design phase, informal discussion of aspects of the topic

will aid in clarifying the total project and help researchers plan their particular focus. After data collection, information sharing among the participants will insure that all available data is brought to bear upon the answering of research questions or in recommending future policy. Any seeming inconsistencies between various reports should be accounted for, just as substantiating findings are noted.

While the Model proposed here has as yet had limited use, it seems to have wide application. Its main advantage is that people can gather data with a cooperatively developed instrument that will be analyzed to produce several different reports. Depending on the quality of the instrument, this is a very efficient way to gather data, both from the researcher's and the respondent's point of view. This Model is flexible in that any feasible method or combination of methods of data collection can be used.

A varied number of researchers can be involved (although there are probably upper limits). The researchers have options as to how quickly they complete their reports. Thus the model is equally applicable to those who have varying time constraints. So far the Model has been used to generate both empirical data and that of a more subjective nature (answers to open-ended questions). Continued use of the Model should further substantiate its usefulness for these and other modes of research.